


~~NO. 22-5301~~
IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES



MICHAEL GEOFFREY PETERS - PETITIONER

VS.

LISA BENCE MICHALK - RESPONDENT
ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
UNITED STATES FIFTH CIRCUIT COURT
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MICHAEL GEOFFREY PETERS
STRINGFELLOW UNIT
1200 FM 655
ROSMARON, TEXAS 77583
(281) 595-3413

ALL (EXHIBITS) FOUND IN SUPREME COURT CASE
NO. 21-5439 OR FIFTH CIRCUIT CASE NO.
19-20717.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. WHETHER OR NOT THE "THREE-STRIKES" PROVISION CAN BE USED AS A WEAPON TO SILENCE ONES FREEDOM OF SPEECH EXPOSING REPUBLICAN PARTY POLITICAL, JUDICIAL AND CORPORATE RACKETEERING CRIMES?
2. WHETHER OR NOT A BIAS JUDGE SHOULD PRESIDE OVER HER CO-WORKERS TRIAL?
3. WHETHER OR NOT IT'S LEGAL TO "RIK" A DEFENDENTS TRIAL TO SILENCE HIS FREEDOM OF SPEECH EXPOSING POLITICAL, JUDICIAL AND CORPORATE RACKETEERING CRIMES?
4. WHETHER OR NOT IT'S LEGAL OR CONSTITUTIONAL FOR CORRUPT JUDICIAL OFFICIALS TO USE A UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE FOR CORRUPT MEANS?
5. WHETHER OR NOT A UNITED STATES COURT CAN BE USED FOR RACKETEERING PURPOSES OR STOP INDIVIDUALS EXPOSING EVIDENCE OF POLITICAL CRIMES?

LIST OF PARTIES

ALL PARTIES ARE LISTED IN THE FOLLOWING RELATED CASES BELOW. ALL CASES STEM FROM THE GOVERNMENTS COVER-UPS FOR POLITICAL, JUDICIAL AND CORPORATE RACKETEERING CRIMES SEEN IN THE FOLLOWING CASE(S):

STARTING WITH MY ANNULMENT AND CONTINUING THROUGH-OUT ALL BELOW CIVIL ACTIONS.

(1) MONTGOMERY COUNTY, TEXAS COURTHOUSE

NO. 12-08-09259-CR ANNULMENT

NO. 14-67-08207-CR TRIAL FOR ALLEGED RETALIATIONS

NO. 4:18-CV-645 APPEALED
U.S. SOUTHERN DISTRICT

NO. 19-20717 APPEALED FIFTH CIRCUIT

NO. 21-5439- APPEALED SUPREME COURT

RELATED CASES

SUPREME COURT:

21-7795, Corrupt Appointed Defense Counsel

21-20371, Judge Defacing Appeal
21-40819, Prosecutor Refuses to Prosecute
21-7766, Corrupt Republican Federal Judges
Aiding Cover-ups

22-20059, " " "
22-20180, " " "
22-20082, " " "
22-20135, " " "
21-7747, " " "
21-20601, " " "
" "

21-20440, Prison Officials Stopping Me
22-40140, Contacting the Media.

21-40473, " " "
21-40560, " " "
21-20546, " " "
20-8406, " " "
21-5507, " " "

21-5439, Supreme Court Clerk Withholds
NY Criminal Case to Time-Bar it

21-7810, Cruel and Unusual Punishment
22-20099, Asst. D.A. Did Conspiracy
21-7740, Texas Children's Corporate Crimes
22-20096, Trial Court Reporter Delete Transcripts
21-7797, Texas Medical Board Cover-up Corp Crimes
22-20094, Supreme Court Clerk Cover-ups
22-20133, Innocent Project Cover-up

20-40547, Prison Officials Steal My Lawbooks
~~21-20346~~ 21-20374, I.R.S. Refuse Me Stimulus
 21-20669, Gov. Greg Abbott Aid Cover-ups
~~21-206~~ 21-40483, Prison Refuse Religious Freedom
 21-20444, "
 20-8406, "
 21-7531, Courts Steal My Homes in Rethelation
 21-40850, Government Slanders Me
 21-20608, City of Conroe use Courts to Racketeer
 21-20373, I Seek Federal Investigations

FIFTH CIRCUIT COURT:

22-20225, Federal Judges Cover-Up Racketeering
 For Bribes ||
 22-20246, ||
 22-20235, ||
 22-40331, ||
 22-40309, ||
 22-20166, ||
 22-20152, ||
 22-20162, ||
 22-20245, Corporate Criminals: Metal
 22-20132, " " Dreyer
 22-20244, Prison Mail Crimes
 22-20185, Child Support Harassments
 22-40302, Kalish Law Firm Crimes

22-20236, Actual Innocent Clinic Cover-ups
22-20182, Innocent Network Cover-ups
22-20091, Baylor Corporate Crimes & Liabilities
22-20179, Tracy Allen Gilbert's Crimes

U.S. SOUTHERN DIST. COURT:

4:22-CV-01672, Corrupt Fed. Judge
4:22-CV-00668, "
H-22-767, Prison Mail Theft
4:22-CV-769, Gov. Greg Abbott
4:22-CV-01674, Baylor Criminals; K. Surden
4:22-CV-01751, Prison Steals Befo O'Rourke's Mail
4:22-CV-00893, Republican Party Crimes

CASES: TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED PAGE NO.

<u>Hurles v. Ryan</u> , 706 F.3d 1021 (CA9 2013)	11
<u>Bracy v. Gramley</u> , 520 U.S. 899, 904, 117 S.Ct. 1793 138 L.Ed. 2d 97 (1997).	11
<u>Withrow vs. Larkin</u> , 421 U.S. 35, 46, 95 S.Ct. 1456, 43 L.Ed. 2d 712 (1975)	11
<u>Washington vs. Texas</u> , 388 U.S. 14, 19, 87 S.Ct. 1920 (1967).	17
<u>Stone v. Powell</u> ,	18
<u>United States vs. Jenkin-Watts</u> , 574 F.3d 940 (8th Cir. 2009)	19-20
<u>United States vs. Faulkner</u> , 17 F.3d 745, 768 (5th Cir. 1994).	21
<u>Bunkley v. Florida</u> , 538 U.S. 835, 155 L.Ed. 2d 1046, 123 S.Ct. 2020 (2003).	21
<u>Hemling v. United States</u> , 418 U.S. 87 118, 94 S.Ct. 1038, 8 L.Ed. 2d 590 (1974)	21
<u>United States vs. Cerll</u> , 105 U.S. 611, 612, 26 L.Ed 1135 (1882).	21
<u>Smith</u> , 132 S.Ct. at 630	27

CASESPAGE NO.

Kyle, 514 U.S. at 435, 115 S.Ct.
1555

27

United States v. Begley, 473 U.S. 667,

676, 105 S.Ct. 3375, 87 L.Ed.2d 481 (1985). 27

Neder, 527 at 7, 119 S.Ct. 1827

Miller, 474 U.S. at 262, 106 S.Ct. 617 27

Racketeering Influence and Corrupt Org-
anization (RICO) 18 USC Sec. 1961-1968 . . . 30

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3-6
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	7-32
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.	33-35
CONCLUSION	36

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX "A" U.S. SOUTHERN DISTRICT
COURTS DECISION

APPENDIX "B" U.S. FIFTH CIRCUIT COURTS
DECISION

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgement(s) below.

OPINIONS BELOW

Federal courts

- The opinion of the U.S. Southern District court appears in Appendix "A"
- The opinion of the U.S. Fifth Circuit court appears in Appendix "B"

Due to corruption no report was published.

JURISDICTION

Federal courts:

- The date on which the U.S. Southern District court decided my case was on April 6, 2022.
- The date on which the U.S. Fifth ~~Cir~~ Circuit court decided my case was on June 15, 2022.

Due to Political, Judicial and Corporate Recklessness cover-ups no rehearing was sought.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. Section 1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

FIRST AMENDMENT: THE RESPONDENT IS A CORRUPT DISTRICT COURT JUDGE WHO WAS INVOLVED IN A CONSPIRACY TO COVER UP POLITICAL, JUDICIAL AND CORPORATE RACKETEERING CRIMES AND USED HER COURT ROOM AND DISCRETION TO SILENCE MY FREEDOM OF SPEECH BY ABUSE OF HER DISCRETION. SHE DENIED ME THE REDRESSABILITY OF MY LEGAL GRIEVANCES EXPOSING THEIR COVER-UPS BY DENYING ME ALL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO PRESENT THE EVIDENCE AND CORROBORATING DEFENSE EXPOSING THEM TO PROTECT PRESIDENTIAL ELECTS, RICH PERRY'S CAMPAIGN.

FOURTH AMENDMENT: THE RESPONDENT AND HER CO-CONSPIRATORS MADE AN ILLEGAL SEARCH WITHOUT PROBABLE CAUSE AND WITHOUT EVIDENCE.

FIFTH AMENDMENT: THE RESPONDENT WAS PART OF A JOINT CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY TO HAVE ME TRIED WITHOUT CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OR ADEQUATE REPRESENTATION, AND DENIED ME DISCOVERY, WITNESSES, MY DEFENSE AND ALL EVIDENCE SUBMITTALS ~~A~~ TO PREVENT MY DUE PROCESS RIGHTS AND UNLAWFULLY STEAL MY LIFE, LIBERTY AND PROPERTY IN ORDER TO SILENCE MY HARMING GOV. RICK PERRY'S PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN BY EXPOSING HIS COLLUSION AND RACKETEERING CRIMES COVERING-UP FOR BAYLOR AND TEXAS CHILDREN'S CORPORATIONS CRIMES AND LIABILITIES IN EXCHANGE FOR POLITICAL FUNDINGS AND BRIBES.

SIXTH AMENDMENT: THE RESPONDENT MADE ELEVEN (11) JURY SELECTIONS HERSELF TO STACK THE JURORS AGAINST ME AND HAD HER CO-CONSPIRATORS MAKE ALL THE REST; THIRTY-THREE (33) STRIKES IN ALL.

THE RESPONDENT DENIED ME A PUBLIC TRIAL, ELECTING INSTEAD TO HAVE A "CLOSED DOOR" TRIAL TO CONCEAL THE DEPRIVATIONS OF ALL MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. SHE STOPPED ME FROM PRESENTING MY DEFENSE OR SUBPOENING ANY WITNESSES SHE AND HER CO-CONSPIRATORS KNEW WOULD CORROBORATE THE EVIDENCE OF MY DEFENSE EXPOSING THEIR COVER-UPS FOR: GOV. RICK PERRY, LOANN DREYER, TRACY GILBERT, TEXAS MEDICAL BOARD, GREG AB- BUTT, BAYLOR CORPORATION, TEXAS CHILD-RENS CORPORATION AND MANY MORE.

EIGHTH AMENDMENT: THE RESPONDENT ORDERED THAT I BE DENIED BAIL WHEREIN I WAS UNABLE TO SEEK OUT LEGAL REPRESENTATION TO EXPOSE THEIR PLOT TO SILENCE ME TO COVER UP POLITICAL, JUDICIAL AND CORPORATE ROCKETERING CRIMES.

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT THE RESPONDENT
ABRIDGED MY PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES
AS A UNITED STATES CITIZEN TO DEPRIVE
ME OF LIFE, LIBERTY AND PROPERTY WITH-
OUT DUE PROCESS OR EQUAL PROTECTIONS
OF THE LAWS.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

THE RESPONDENT WAS THE DISTRICT COURT JUDGE IN THE THUNDERED-UP CHARGES OF RETALIATION THE REPUBLICANS PLOTTED WITH TRIAL COURT OFFICIALS TO HAVE ME "INTENTIONALLY WRONGFULLY IMPRISONED" BY ORCHESTRATING A ONE-SIDED TRIAL THAT WAS CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC TO SECRET WHAT THEY WERE DOING. THESE CONSPIRATORS STOOD TO GAIN BOTH PRESIDENTIAL FAVOR HAD GOV. RICK PERRY BEEN ELECTED AND CORPORATE BRIBES FROM THE CORPORATIONS OF TEXAS CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL AND BAYLOR COLLEGE OF MEDICINE WHO GOV. PERRY WAS IN COLLUSION WITH TO OBTAIN FUNDING FOR HIS PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN IN EXCHANGE FOR CORPORATE PROTECTIONS FROM THEIR CRIMES AND LIABILITIES COMMITTED AND CAUSED BY THE STATE'S WITNESS: DR/DIRECTOR ZODANNE E. DREYER. SEE FIFTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 19-20717 AND SUPREME COURT CASE NO. 21-5439 FOR FACTS AND EVIDENCE. ALSO SEE MONTGOMERY COUNTY COURT CASES: NO. 12-08-09259-CR (ANNULMENT) THE BEGINNING OF THE GOVERNMENT COVER-UP AND CASE NO. 14-07-08207-CR THE FAKED TRIAL.

KEY COURTHOUSE CONSPIRATORS

THE KEY MEMBERS OF THIS RIGGED TRIAL WERE AS FOLLOWS:

- (1) APPOINTED DEFENSE COUNSEL: KATHA VALIGORA
- (2) " " ANTHONY DUCKINORTH
- (3) JUDGE: LISA BENGE MICHAEL
- (4) PROSECUTOR: JEFF MOHL
- (5) COURT REPORTERS: CATHY BUSA
- (6) " " RENAE YOUNG
- (7) PLAINTIFFS JUDGE: TRACY ALLEN GILBERT
- (8) " " WIFE: NANCY GILBERT
- (9) ASST. D.A.: PHIL LRONT
- (10) STATE'S WITNESS: LOANN E. DREYER, M.D.

DETAILS OF THESE CONSPIRATORS PARTS IN THIS COVER-UP FOR REPUBLICAN PARTY POLITICAL, JUDICIAL AND CORPORATE, COLLUSION AND RACKETEERING RICO CRIMES IS BEST SEEN IN FIFTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 19-20717. ITS (EXHIBITS), BRIEF, C.O.A. AND APPLICATION FOR THE C.O.A.. SINCE THIS CASE INVOLVES THE RESPONDENT ALONE, ILL REFER TO HER INVOLVEMENTS AND HOW SHE ORCHESTRATED THIS COVER-UP AND PLOTTED TO MAKE AN INNOCENT MAN SENT TO PRISON FOR THIRTY-FIVE (35) TO SILENCE HIS FREEDOM OF SPEECH EXPOSING THOSE WHO COMMITTED

CRIMINAL ACTS TO ABDUCT HIS SON, DARTON G. PETERS.

III.

VIEWING THE (APPROX. 180+ PAGES OF EXHIBITS IN FIFTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 19-20717) I PROCEED TO OUTLINE HER (RESPONDENTS) CRIMES.

IV.

SEEN IN (EXHIBIT NO. 57, 57B) YOU'LL SEE THE INDICTMENT. COUNT NO. I, PHONE HARASSMENT; COUNT II ASSAULT BY ~~YOU TUBE~~ ^{PHONE} MESSAGE; COUNT NO. III ASSAULT BY YOUTUBE VIDEO.

(EXHIBIT NO. 88) SHOWS THE JURY'S ACQUITTAL FOR COUNT NO. II. LEAVING THE REMAINING TWO (2) COUNTS OF RETALIATION. (PHONE HARASSMENT) AND (ASSAULT BY YOUTUBE VIDEO).

SEEN IN (EXHIBIT NO. 89) CONVICTED INMATE: MICHAEL R. CASTLEBERRY IS SENTENCED FOR THE SAME OFFENSE, WITH THE SAME AMOUNT OF PRIORS, BUT ONLY RECEIVES (7 MONTHS) STATE JAIL, WHILE ED BEEN OUT OF TROUBLE (31) YEAR AND FOR THE SAME OFFENSE RECEIVE (35) YEARS PROVING THE VINDICTIVENESS OF THESE CONSPIRATORS INNO BLAME ME FOR HARMING GOV. RICK PERRY'S PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

BY MAKING YOUTUBE VIDEOS EXPOSING HIS APPONT-
OF IRVIN ZETLER TO THE TEXAS MEDICAL BOARD'S
DIRECTOR AT "HIS DISCRETION" TO COVER-UP THE
STATE'S INITIATES CRIMES TO PROTECT SAID COR-
PORATIONS WHO WERE FUNDING HIS POLITICAL
CAMPAIGN TO BECOME THE REPUBLICAN'S PRESIDENT.
SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 135 & 140).

THE STATE'S INITIATES WAS
ALSO BEING EXPOSED. SEE (EXHIBITS NO 136 & 139)
ALSO THE PLAINTIFF, JUDGE TRACY ALLEN GUDER
WHO WAS RUNNING FOR "RE-ELECTION" AT THIS
TIME, SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 137).

THE TEXAS MEDICAL
BOARD, TEXAS CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL, BAYLOR WHO IN-
SURED DR. DREYER ALL HAD "MOTIVES" FOR WANT-
ING TO "SILENCE ME". Z WAS POSTING THE EVID-
ENCE PROVING DREYER'S CRIMES AND THE GOV-
ERMENTS COVER-UP FOR THESE CORPORATIONS LIA-
BILITIES. SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 137)

THE CORPORATIONS
HIRED A PRIVATE INVESTIGATOR TO STALK ME AT
MY HOME, SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 136)

II.

EVIDENCE ALL COVERED-UP IN SAID TRIAL(S) PROVES
THAT THESE CORPORATIONS SPENT OVER ONE-MILLION

VI.

HURLES V. RYAN, 706 F3d 1021 (CA 9 2013)

THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT ESTABLISHES A CONSTITUTIONAL FLOOR, NOT A UNIFORM STANDARD. FOR JUDICIAL BIAS CLAIM. BRACY V. GRAMLEY, 520 U.S. 899, 904, 117 S.Ct. 1793, 138 L.Ed 2d 97 (1997).

VII.

WHILE MOST CLAIMS OF JUDICIAL BIAS ARE RESOLVED BY COMMON LAW, STATUTE OR THE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS OF THE BENCH AND BAR. "THE FLOOR ESTABLISHED BY THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE CLEARLY REQUIRES A FAIR TRIAL IN A FAIR TRIBUNAL" BEFORE A JUDGE WITH NO ACTUAL BIAS AGAINST THE DEFENDANT OR INTERESTS IN THE OUTCOME OF A PARTICULAR CASE. ID. AT 904-05, 117 S.Ct. 1793 (QUOTING WITHROW V. LARKIN, 421 U.S. 35, 46, 95 S.Ct. 1456, 43 L.Ed. 2d 712 (1975)).

VIII.

THE CONSTITUTION REQUIRES RECUSAL WHERE "THE PROBABILITY OF ACTUAL BIAS ON THE PART OF A JUDGE OR DECISION MAKER IS TOO HIGH TO BE CONSTITUTIONALLY TOLERABLE. WITHROW, 421 U.S. AT 47, 95 S.Ct. 1456.

DOLLAR AT MY ANNOUNCEMENT ALONE. ALL HAD MOTIVES ~~FOR~~ FOR PLOTTING AGAINST ME.

RESPONDENT'S CRIMINAL PLOT

(A) DENIED JURY STRIKES

THE RESPONDENT MADE ELEVEN (11) JURY STRIKES HERSELF TO STACK THE JURY. REMOVED EVERYONE WHO EVEN QUESTIONED THE PUNISHMENT OR WHY SO MUCH TIME WAS REQUIRED. DELETED BY HER COURT REPORTERS WAS A ~~LEAST~~ LENGTHY OUTBURST BY JUROR NO. (1) (MERL J. THOMAS). ALL SEVENTY-TWO (72) JURY SELECTS WOULD HAVE REMEMBERED THIS OUTBURST AND THATS WHY THE COURT REPORTERS DELETED IT FROM THE OFFICIAL COURT TRANSCRIPTS PROOVING THEIR CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY PLOT. STATES WITNESS DREYER ALSO MADE AN OUTBURST STATING ("I DO NOT WANT TO BE HERE") IN A MOMENT OF WEAKNESS, SHE WAS BREAKING DOWN SO THEY (CONSPIRATORS) COVERED IT UP.

HAD RESPONDENT MADE THE JURY STRIKES FOR "CAUSE" AS SHE STATES WHY DIDN'T SHE STRIKE JUROR NO. (1)? WHO'S OUTBURST PROVED THE JURY WAS TAINTED. THE CONSPIRATORS REFUSED TO ALLOW ME TO MAKE ANY STRIKES! SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 91)

(B) DENIED ALL DEFENSE MOTIONS

THE RESPONDENT REFUSED TO RECUSE HERSELF AS SHE HAD IN ANOTHER ONE OF JUDGE GILBERTS CASES. SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 73). SHE PROVED HERSELF TO BE BOTH PREJUDICE AND BIAS TOWARDS ME. SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 101) AND (EXHIBIT NO. 102H).

YOU CAN SEE THE VENOMOUS WAY IN WHICH THE RESPONDENT STRIKES-OUT THE MOTION FOR A CHANGE OF VENUE. HER PLAN WAS TO USE HER DISCRETION TO INFLUENCE THE OUTCOME OF HER FRIEND AND CO-WORKERS CASE WHO HAD AIDED IN HER JUDICIAL TRAINING.

SHEM THROUGH-OUT (EXHIBITS NO. 102A THRU 102H) SHE DENIES:

- (1) BAIL (TO STOP MY SEEKING OUTSIDE HELP)
- (2) MOTION TO QUASH THE INDICTMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT NOTICE OF THE CHARGES.
- (3) SHE DENIED WITHDRAWAL OF CORRUPTED COUNSEL WHO WAS A MEMBER TO THEIR PLOT.
- (4) SHE REFUSE A TIME EXTENSION FOR VOIR DIRE TO PREVENT JURY NOTIFICATIONS WHICH COULD ONLY HARM THEIR PLOT TO KEEP THE JURY KEPT IN THE DARK.
- (5) MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE TO OBTAIN THE ADDITIONAL PHONE CALL RECORDS PROVING MY ACTUAL INNOCENCE TO COUNT NO. (1).

(C) DENIED ALL DEFENSE WITNESSES

BOTH APPOINTED DEFENSE COUNSELS STATED WHEN ASKED TO PRESENT MY DEFENSE, THAT THE RESPONDENT INSTRUCTED THEM THEY COULD NOT PRESENT MY DEFENSE PROVING THAT HER FRIEND AND CO-WORKER, JUDGE TRACY A. GILBERT HAD COVERED-UP THE STATE'S WITNESSES CRIMES AT THE ANNULMENT WHEN SHE FALSIFIED MY SON'S MEDICAL RECORDS TO DECEIVE JUDGE JENNIFER RUBIN HIS ASSO. JUDGE (GILBERT'S). GILBERT WAS A BAYLOR GRADUATE, WHO'D HAD UNETHICAL MEETING WITH SAID CORPORATIONS ATTORNEYS, TOOK A "BRIBE" FROM THEM AND COVERED-UP FOR THEM.

PROVING HIS GUILT WAS CRITICAL TO EXPOSING THE GOVERNMENTS COVER-UPS. RESPONDENT COVERS-UP BY STATING; SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 101) LINES 13-20, THAT THE LAWYER JUDGE GILBERT "FALSLEY ACCUSED" HAD NO RELATIONSHIP TO HIS FALSLEY ACCUSING ME. SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 75) SHOWING ACCUSED LAWYER WAS ACQUITTED, RATHER NO BILLED, BY THE GRAND JURY. SHE COVERS-UP FOR JUDGE GILBERT. SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 100), AND 101) IN BOTH CASES, MINE AND LAWYER RIGBY ^{MAY} OWEN, GILBERT

MAKE'S FALSE ALLEGATIONS AGAINST OTHERS WHO EXPOSE HIM TO THE MEDIA'S DURING HIS ELECTIONS. (EXHIBITS NOS. 105 THRU 112) SHOW MY COMPLAINTS TO THE COURT FOR REFUSING ALL MY DEFENSE WITNESSES AS WELL AS ALL DEFENSE EVIDENCE SUBMITTALS. (EXHIBIT NO. 110) PROVES THE DISTRESS I WAS IN THAT THE RESPONDENT WAS GOING TO COVER-UP FOR THIS "POLITICAL, JUDICIAL AND CORPORATE RACKETEERING. IT WAS HOPELESS AS THEY'D EVEN HAD JAIL OFFICIALS PREVENT MY BRINGING MY LEGAL DOCUMENTS TO THE COURT TO STOP MY SHOWING THE JURORS. I'M FORCED INTO ACCUSING THEM TO PLOT AGAINST ME OR BE REMOVED FROM MY OWN TRIAL FOR CRYING-OUT. SEE (EXHIBITS NO. 111-12)

(D) DENIED ALL EVIDENCE SUBMITTALS IN SUPPORT OF MY ONLY VIABLE DEFENSE. AGAIN SEE (EXHIBITS NO. 105 THRU 112)

WITNESSES

DEFENSE WITNESSES WERE NUMEROUS AND ALL CORROBORATED THE EVIDENCE OF THE STATES WITNESSES CRIMES, WHICH IS WHY THESE CONSPIRATORS REFUSED TO ALLOW MY ONLY VIABLE

DEFENSE PROOVING STATES WITNESSES, ZORNN E. DREYER CONSPIRED WITH OTHERS TO PRESENT FABRICATED MEDICAL RECORDS AT THE ANNULMENT CHILD CUSTODY HEARINGS TO DECEIVE JUDGE JENNIFER ROBIN. IN (EXHIBITS NO. 13 THRU 21) EVIDENCE PROVES BAYLOR R.N. ROBIN HAIDACHER AND BAYLOR SOCIAL-WORKER, JACQUELYN OKEKE, CHILD PROTECTION SERVICES (C.P.S.) SUPERVISOR, PAMELA THOMAS AND (C.P.S.) CASE-WORKER AMY LOGGINS ALL CONCURRED THAT DREYER AND HER CO-CONSPIRATOR, MITAL K. BRAHMBHATT CONSPIRED AND MADE FALSE ACCUSATIONS FABRICATING TEXAS CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL MEDICAL RECORDS. EVIDENCE ALSO PROVES JOHN COLDIERONE ANOTHER DAD-VICTIM OF MITAL AND DREYER WOULD HAVE MADE AN EXCELLENT WITNESS PROOVING THEIR HISTORY OF ABUSE AGAINST DADS.

SEEN IN (EXHIBIT NO. 54-56) EVIDENCE PROVES THAT ANNULMENT JUDGE JAMES DOUGLAS SQUIRE "STRUCK-OUT" DREYER'S FALSE ACCUSATIONS MY EX-WIFE'S LAWYER'S WROTE INTO THE FINAL DIVORCE DECREE, PROOVING HE DID NOT BELIEVE DREYER'S FABRICATED MEDICAL RECORDS EITHER. UNLIKE JUDGE GILBERT WHO WAS IN ON THIS CORPORATE CRIMINAL COVER-UP, JUDGE SQUIRE ACCUSED ME TO "PRESENT" THE

EVIDENCE PROVING DREYER FABRICATED THE TEXAS CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL'S MEDICAL RECORDS. THESE PROFESSIONALS ARE THE "STATE OF TEXAS" AUTHORITIES MOST CAPABLE BY PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS TO ASCERTAIN WHETHER OR NOT MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE OCCURRED OR DID NOT AND "ALL" PROVED BY THEIR REPORTS AND RECORDS THAT THE STORES WITNESS LIED IN HER TESTIMONY ON THE WITNESS STAND TO THE JURY. SEE (EXHIBITS NO. 46-48). ALSO EVIDENCE PROVES THROUGH-OUT THE TRIAL AND ALL THROUGH THE APPEALATE PROCESS "REPUBLICANS" COVERED-UP DREYER'S CRIMES TO PROTECT THE CORPORATIONS OF BAYLOR AND TEXAS CHILDREN'S FOR BRIBES AND POLITICAL FUNDING FOR RICK PERRY'S PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN IN 2012.

SIXTH AMENDMENT

GUARANTEES EVERY DEFENDANT COMPULSORY PROCESS FOR OBTAINING WITNESSES IN HIS FAVOR. THE RIGHT TO PRESENT WITNESSES IS THE RIGHT TO PRESENT A DEFENSE AND THEREFORE A FUNDAMENTAL ELEMENT OF DUE PROCESS. Washington v. Texas, 388 U.S. 14, 19, 87 S.Ct. 1920 (1967).

(D) DENIED MOTION TO SUPPRESS BUT
ALLOWED PREJUDICIAL UNRELATED CON-
JECTURE TO BIAS THE JURORS.

SEEN IN (EXHIBITS NO. 93-95) I ASK MY DEFENSE
COUNSEL TO FILE A MOTION TO SUPPRESS SOME
DUMB INTERNET RHETORIC COMMENTS ABOUT COP
KILLERS. AS SKE COUNSEL REFUSED TO FILE THIS
MOTION AS WE INDY PART OF MOVING ME (INTEN-
TIONALLY INJUSTICELY IMPRISONED TO SILENCE MY
EXPOSING GOV. RICK PERRY'S COLLUSION WITH SAID
CORPORATIONS COVER-UPS. THE CONSPIRATORS PLAN WAS
PREJUDICE THE JURY AGAINST ME AND HAVE THE
JURY SILENCE ME. THEY HAD TO DUMB FOUND THEM.
THE CONSPIRATORS ALLOWED (103) EXTRA YOU-
TUBE VIDEOS I MADE TO EXPOSE DREYER AND
GTHRS RELATED TO HER COVER-UPS. YOU CAN
SEE IN THE INDICTMENT IN COUNT NO. (1) THEY
EVEN DELETED ANONYMOUS AND INTENTIONALLY
THROUGH-OUT THE TRIAL NEVER ALLOW THE JURY
KNOW THE ELEMENTS OF ^{the} ~~the~~ THE STATUTES.
SEE (EXHIBITS NO. 80 & 114). SEEN IN (EXHIBITS
NO. 78-79-79A) See Stear v. Powell //

"THE JURY'S QUESTIONS TO THE COURT DURING THEIR DELIBERATION". YOU CAN SEE BY ALLOWING THE JURY TO VIEW THE (103) YouTube VIDEOS MADE TO EXPOSE DRIVER, THE JURORS BECAME CONFUSED AND COULD NO LONGER ASCERTAIN WHICH (4) THEY WERE THERE TO DELIBERATE. (EXHIBITS NO. 79-A). AS SEEN THE RESPONDENT REFUSED TO ENLIGHTEN THEM TO KEEP THEM UNINFORMED AND IN THE DARK. IT WAS THE JUDGE'S DUTY TO MAKE SURE THE JURY UNDERSTOOD THE CHARGED OFFENSES, THATS WHY THERE IS A QUESTION SHEET. BUT FOR HER BEING A MEMBER OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY'S COVER-UP MY ACTUAL INNOCENCE TO THE CHARGE WOULD HAVE BEEN ACQUITTED.

"WHEN A JURY EXPLICITLY REQUEST A SUPPLEMENT INSTRUCTION, A TRIAL COURT MUST TAKE GREAT CARE TO ENSURE THAT ANY SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTIONS ARE ACCURATE [AND] CLEAR. United States vs.

Jenkin-Watts, 574, F.3d 940, 964 (8th Cir. 2009) granted appeal/reversed.

(E) WITHHOLDING THE ELEMENTS OF THE STATUTES TO CONFOUND THE JURY AND LEAD THEM INTO A WRONGFUL CONVICTION.

AS SEEN IN THE INDICTMENT (EXHIBITS NO. 57-57B) THE CONSPIRATORS LEFT OUT THE ELEMENT OF 'ANNOYANCE' IN COUNT NO. (1) AS TESTIMONY PROVED SEE (EXHIBITS NO. 66 AND 65) THAT THE PLAINTIFF'S 'BOTH' STATED THE PHONE CALLS WERE NOT MADE ANNOYANCE, SO THE CONSPIRATORS JUST DELETED THAT ELEMENT. ASST. D.A. PAUL GRANT IS SO EMBOLDEN HE WRITES HIS 'OWN' COMMENTS INTO THE INDICTMENT. AT NO TIME DURING THE TRIAL WAS THE JURY INFORMED OF THE ELEMENT FOR 'ASSAULT'. COUNT NO. (3) WAS 'ASSAULT BY YOUTUBE VIDEO' SO IT WAS 'CRITICIZED' THE JURY KNEW HOW TO APPLY AN ASSAULT TO THOSE (4) YOUTUBE VIDEOS. SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 78-79) AT (78) THE JURORS ASK: ("COULD WE PLEASE HAVE THE DEFINITION OF ASSAULT") AND THE RESPONDENT INHU'S DUTY IT WAS TO INSTRUCT THEM) United States v. Jenkins - Watts, 574 F.3d 940, 964 (8th Cir 2009) REFUSED SAYING: ("YOU HAVE ALL THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE CHARGE. 'I AM NOT ALLOWED TO ANSWER 20 THE QUESTION").

THE PLOT WAS TO CONVINCE THE JURY INTO MAKING AN UNINFORMED DECISION. The evidence is sufficient to support a conviction if a rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt. United States v. Faulkner, 17 F.3d 745, 768 (5th Cir. 1994). DUE PROCESS CLAUSE FORBIDS A STATE FROM CONVICTING A PERSON OF A CRIME WITHOUT PROVING THE ELEMENTS OF THAT CRIME BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT. Bunkley v. Florida, 538 U.S. 835, 155 L.Ed 2d 1046, 123 S.Ct. 2020 (2003). [SCOTUS] Hamling v. United States, 418 U.S. 87 118, 94 S.Ct. 1038, 8 L.Ed. 2d 590 (1974). ALSO United States v. Carll, 105 U.S. 611, 612, 26 L.Ed 1135 (1882).

WITHHOLDING PHONE RECORDS
CRITICAL TO PROVING ACTUAL INNOCENCE

THERE WAS AN ELABORATE PLOT TO WITHHOLD THE PHONE RECORDS PROVING MY INNOCENCE, BY THESE CONSPIRATORS. THE RESPONDENT AND HER APPOINTED DEFENSE COUNSEL SEEMED TO HAVE EVEN A JOKE PARADE: ("OUT OF THE ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION"). SEE (EXHIBITS N4 81 & 83) BOTH CONCERNING THE WITHHOLDING OF THE ADDITIONAL

PHONE CALL RECORDS) THE PLAINTIFF'S WIFE MARY GILBERTS CONFESSES SHE MET WITH THE ATTORNEY OR DISTRICT ATTORNEY - THE "ALLEGED" BEFORE THE TRIAL. SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 70) WHEREIN THEY DISCUSSED THESE ALLEGED ADDITIONAL PHONE CALLS. MARY WILL LATER CONFESS THE ONLY PHONE CALLS SHE KNEW WERE THE "ONES" POINTED OUT TO HER THAT DAY. SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 71) HER HUSBAND JUDGE GILBERT WHO FIRST COVERED UP BAYLOR AND TEXAS CHILDRENS LIABILITIES FOR A BRIEF TOOK PHOTOS OF HIS CALDER Z.D., AND MY VEHICLE AND EVEN TOOK OUT (14) ²⁵⁰ SENTENCES OUT OF CONTEXT - FABRICATING HIS OWN EVIDENCE SEEN IN THE INDICTMENT IN COUNT NO. (3). SEE (EXHIBITS NO. 72, 76, 84) THE ONLY EVIDENCE SUBMITTED IN COUNT NO. (1) WAS (EXHIBITS NO. 97-99, PLUS ONE MORE AND EXHIBITS NO. 85-87). AND DOESN'T PROVE ANYTHING BUT TWO (2) PHONE CALLS (42) DAYS DAYS APART AS ^{SEEN} SEEN IN (EXHIBITS NO. 65-66) AGAIN PROVING NOTHING THAT ELUDES TO PHONE HARASSMENT.

PLOT

THE REASON FOR THE MEETINGS AT THE PLAINTIFF'S HOME WITH THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY PAUL GRANT WHO "6" JUDGE GILBERT CALLED HIS

FABRICATED EVIDENCE TO: SEE (EXHIBIT NO 64)
AND WHO PLEADED WITH JUDGE GILBERT TO HAVE
IMPRISON MR. SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 57B) WHERE AS
STATED HE ADDS HIS OWN COMMENTS, "GILBERT
JUST WANTED TO SEE IF ANY OF THOSE (14) SEN-
TENCES (CROSS A LINE) SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 64). IT
APPEARS BY THE INDICTMENT JUDGE GILBERT HIT
THE LOTTERY AT ALL (14) SENTENCES WERE SIMPLY
TRANSFERRED INTO AN OFFICIAL INDICTMENT.

THE REAL REASON AS MARY STATED WAS TO DISCUSS
"NON-EXISTANT" PHONE CALLS SAID BE LYING TO
THE JURY ABOUT DURING THE TRIAL. SEE (EXHIBITS
NO. 67-69).

(ACTUAL INNOCENCE)

SEEN IN (EXHIBIT NO. 407-08) THE STATE ATTOR-
NEY GENERAL'S OFFICE CONFESSES THERE WERE
NO PHONE CALLS THE YEAR PRIOR TO JUNE 14, 2014
BUT ALLUDES THERE WERE MANY BETWEEN
JUNE 14, 2014 AND JULY 26, 2014. SEE (EXHIBITS
NO. 85-87) PROVING NOT ONLY WERE THERE NO
("PHONE CALLS PRIOR, BUT ALSO NONE IN BETWEEN,
THOSE DATES. THIS PROVES I WAS INNOCENT
OF COUNT NO.(1). (EXHIBITS NO 65-66) WERE
THE ONLY TWO (2) CALLS OVER A (42) DAY
PERIOD.

PLUG EXPOSED

BEFORE THE TRIAL STARTED PROSECUTOR; JEFF MOHL STATED: ("REGARD TO THE "ADDITIONAL PHONE CALL EVIDENCE" I JUST WANTED TO MAKE "SURE" EVERYONE IS AWARE. THE DAY I "RECEIVED" THAT INFORMATION, I RELATED IT TO DEFENSE. IT WASN'T THAT, YOU KNOW, WE HAD IT AND JUST NEVER GAVE IT TO HIM. IT WAS LAST WEEK") SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 82)

NOW COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENSE DID NOT GREET MEANING HE HAD THE "ADDITIONAL PHONE CALL EVIDENCE".

HOWEVER HE STATES INSTEAD: ("I HAVE "SUBPOENAED THE RECORDS" FOR MR. PETERS CELL PHONE (MY ONLY PHONE) FOR THE TIME IN QUESTION AS WELL, PLUS BACK ON ADDITIONAL SIX MONTHS "JUST BEING OUT OF AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION". I WAS ONLY ABLE TO DO THAT THURSDAY OF LAST WEEK. SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 82)

RESPONDENT

NOW THE RESPONDENT ALSO STATES OUT OF THE ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 83) SEEM LIKE A KEY PHRASE... "SEE" SHE STATES: ("I THOUGHT ABOUT THIS OVER THE WEEKEND. "I HAVE REVIEWED THE FILE"

AND I AM NOT GOING TO LET YOU GET INTO
THE OTHER CALLS, EXCEPT IF WE REACH PUNIS-
HMENT. SHE GOES ON TO SAY, "AND I DON'T
THINK IT'S FAIR TO THE DEFENDANT TO BRING
UP ~~ADDITIONAL~~ ^{info} AT THE "ELEVENTH HOUR"
ADDITIONAL CALLS.

EVIDENCE PROVES (SEE EXHIBIT
NO. 407-08) THAT THE FILE THE RESPONDENT
STATED SHE'D VIEWED OVER THE WEEKEND PROVE
BEYOND ANY REASONABLE DOUBT THOSE SO
CALLED PHONE RECORDS WERE BLANK, DEVOID
OF ANY EVIDENCE I MADE THOSE ADDITIONAL
PHONE CALLS MARY GILBERT WAS COACHED
INTO LYING ABOUT, AND THE RESPONDENT
WAS PART OF THE PLOT TO HAVE ME (IN-
TENTIONALLY WRONGFULLY IMPRISONED) BY
KEEPING THE JURY DUMBFOUNDED BY THEIR
QUESTIONS DURING DELIBERATIONS PROVED.

DENIED WITNESSES AT
TWO (2) TRIALS

AS STATED THE COURT-UP FOR SAID CORPORATE
CRIMES BEGAN DURING MY ANNULMENT, CASE
NO. 12-08-09259-CR AND CONTINUED THROUGH
CASE NO. 14-07-08207-CR WHEREIN RESPONDENT
PRESIDED.

SEEN IN (EXHIBITS NO. 150A AND 152) MY
DEFENSE WITNESSES PROVING THE STATES WIT-
NESSES CRIMES WERE DENIED. IN (EXHIBIT NO.
152) YOU CAN SEE JUDGE GILBERT SIGNED THE
ORDER QUASHING THOSE WITNESSES. HE IS A
GRADUATE OF BAYLOR UNIVERSITY A SUBSIDIARY
OF BAYLOR COLLEGE OF MEDICINE RESPONSIBLE
FOR THE STATE WITNESSES CRIMES.

COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENSE EVEN FILES A
"MOTION FOR A NEW TRIAL" BASED ON THE
ADDITIONAL PHONE CALL RECORDS THEY ALL
WITHHELD. SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 120, 120A, B & C)
(EXHIBITS NO. 128-29) SHOW THAT THE "NINTH
COURT OF APPEALS LOCATED: 1001 PEARL STREET,
BEDFORD, TEXAS 77701 DENIED THE MOTION FOR
NEW TRIAL BECAUSE SAID APPOINTED DEFENSE
COUNSEL REFUSED TO SUBMIT THE ("ADDITIONAL
PHONE CALL ^{CALL} RECORDS") HE STATED HE'D
SUBPOENAED. . . HE CONTINUED TO WITHHOLD THIS
EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE EVEN WHEN ASKED
BY THE STATE TO DO SO. SEE (EXHIBIT NO 150
(d)). WHEREIN HE STATES ("THE SUPPLEMENTAL
PHONE RECORDS CONTAIN PRIVATE INFORMATION
OF THE COMPLAINING WITNESS AND I AM PRE-
CLUDED BY ARTICLE 39.14 OF THE TEXAS CODE OF

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE FROM ANY SUCH DIS-
CLOSURE. OF COURSE THIS WOULD JUST BE LIKE AS APT.
39.14 C. 9.3 A PROVE WE COULD MAKE.

See ~~(E)~~ Smith, 132 S.Ct. at 630 also Kyle
514 U.S. at 435, 115 S.Ct. 1555 (evidence is
material for Brady. United State vs Bagley
473 U.S. 667, 676, 105 S.Ct. 3375, 87 L.Ed.2d
481 (1985).

(F) UNCONSTITUTIONAL JURY STRIKES

SEEN IN (EXHIBITS NO. 91-9292B, 96A-96D) THE RE-
SPONDENT MAKES ELEVEN (11) JURY STRIKES FOR
CAUSE AND REFUSES TO ALLOW ME TO MAKE ANY.
EVEN THOUGH SHE HAD HER COURT REPORTERS DEL-
ETE JUROR NO. (1) CHERYL J. THOMAS'S OUTBURST
DURING THE VOIR DIRE (72) JURY SELECTIONS WOULD
REMEMBER. SINCE I HAD NOT ALLOWED DISCOVERY
ONLY AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING COULD PROVE THIS.
HOWEVER RESPONDENT DID NOT STRIKE HER AS
JUROR NO. (1) WAS MORE THAN LIKELY A PLANT.

UNCONSTITUTIONAL JURY STRIKES IS A STRUCTURAL
ERROR Neder, 527 U.S. at 7, 119 S.Ct. 1827. See
Miller, 474 U.S. at 262, 106 S.Ct. 617.

(G) DENIED DEFENSE

See Fifth Cir. Case No. 19-20717 and Supreme Court Case No. 21-5439 for evidence and exhibits. EVIDENCE AND FACTS PROVE THE PLAINTIFF, JUDGE GILBERT COVERED-UP FOR STATES WITNESSES CRIMES. SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 405, 405A-405D) PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO RESPONDENTS PARENTING PLAN, FILED AT THE ANNULMENT. ALSO SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 77) WHEREIN JUDGE GILBERT ADMITS THE CORPORATE ATTORNEYS FROM BOYLOR AND TEXAS CHILDREN'S WERE AT THE ANNULMENT. THE FACT IS THEY NEVER MISSED A HEARING IN (13) MONTHS. AS SHOWN HE SKIPPED THE ORDER QUESTIONING ALL DEFENSE WITNESSES AS THE TRIAL COURT DID AS WELL. MY DEFENSE WAS ALWAYS ABOUT THE GOVERNMENTS COVER-UP FOR CORPORATE CRIMES FAKING MEDICAL RECORDS BECAUSE TO MY SON TO ABDUCT HIM FROM MY CUSTODY AFTER THREE (3) PRIOR FAILED ATTEMPTS TO DO THE SAME. SEE FIFTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 19-20717. AND WHEN I SOUGHT TO EXPOSE THEM THE GOVERNMENT CONSPIRED AND PLOTTED TO SILENCE ME BECAUSE GOV. DICK DEERY HIRED AT HIS DISCRETION: DR. IRVIN ZETTLER AS DIRECTOR OF

TEXAS MEDICAL BOARD TO COVER-UP THESE CORPORATIONS CRIMES TO OBTAIN THEIR FUNDING FOR HIS PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN IN 2012. EVIDENCE PROVES THE TEXAS MEDICAL BOARD DID COVER-UP, MEANING GOV. RICK PERRY WAS IN COLLUSION WITH THEM AT THE TIME OF SAID CAMPAIGN. SEE (EXHIBITS NO. 122, 122A).

(EXHIBITS NO. 9, 9A) PROVE COUNTY AND CORPORATE ATTORNEYS BOTH WORKED IN UNIFORM TO OUBSTAIN MY WITNESSES PROVING STATE'S WITNESSES CRIMES. ALSO SEE (EXHIBITS NO. 7-E)

CORPORATE EXPOSURE

THE CORPORATIONS FINANCING THEIR COVER-UPS WERE MOTIVATED TO DO SO BY (EXHIBITS NO. 1-6) SHOWING MY PROTESTS AND UP-LOADING OR PASSING THE EVIDENCE OF DREYERS CRIMES.

(EXHIBITS NO. 134-140) SHOW MY "UP-LOADING" THE EVIDENCE OF THEIR CRIMES AND COVER-UPS. (EXHIBITS NO. 135-140) EXPLICITLY EXPOSING PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE; GOV. RICK PERRY. THEY (REPUBLICAN PARTY) KNEW THEY COULD NOT SUE ME AND FREDERICK "HIGH LIGHTING" THIS MATTER, SO GOV. GREG ABRAHAM WHO AT THIS TIME WAS GOV. RICK PERRY'S ATTORNEY GENERAL COLLED

THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY TO
HAVE ME SILENCED NO MATTER HOW IT WAS
DONE. RECORDS SHOW ON MARCH 2021 AFTER I
FILED MY SECOND CRIMINAL COMPLAINT WITH
HARRIS COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY, ONE WEEK
LATER GOV. LEE'S ABBOTT'S ATTORNEY GENERAL
KEN DIXON ~~AS~~^{MY} CALLED IN A SCHEDULED
PRISON LOW LIBRARY PHONE CALL TO ASK
ME ("WE WANT YOU TO DROP YOUR COMPLA-
INT").

GOV. ABBOTT IS WORRIED ABOUT HIS
INVOLVEMENT IN CONSPIRACIES TO HAVE ME
INTENTIONALLY WRONGFULLY IMPRISONED TO
SILENCE MY FREEDOM OF SPEECH EXPOSING
THE REPUBLICAN PARTY. I AM A POLITICAL
PRISONER FOR BLOWING THE WHISTLE ON THEIR
CONSPIRACY AND RACKETEERING INFLUENCE
AND CRIMINAL ~~ORGANIZATION~~^{CRIMINAL} ORGANIZATION (RICO)
Racketeering Influence and Criminal Organization
Act (RICO) 18 USC SECTION 1961-1968.

VIOLATIONS OF THE RICO LAWS CAN BE ALLEGED
IN CIVIL CONSUMER CASES OR FOR CRIMINAL
CHARGES. IN THESE INSTANCES CHARGES CAN BE

BROUGHT AGAINST INDIVIDUALS OR CORPORATIONS IN RETALIATION FOR SAID INDIVIDUALS OR CORPORATIONS WORKING WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT. FURTHER, CHARGES CAN ALSO BE BROUGHT AGAINST INDIVIDUALS OR CORPORATIONS WHO HAVE SUED OR FILED CRIMINAL CHARGES AGAINST A DEFENDANT.

ANTI-SLAPP (strategic lawsuit against public participation) LAWS CAN BE APPLIED IN AN ATTEMPT TO CURB ALLEGED ABUSES OF THE LEGAL SYSTEM BY INDIVIDUALS OR CORPORATIONS WHO USE THE COURTS AS A "WEAPON" TO RETALIATE AGAINST ("INJUSTICE-BLOWERS, VICTIMS OR TO SILENCE ANOTHERS SPEECH")

RICO COULD BE ALLEGED IF IT CAN BE SHOWN THAT LAWYERS AND/OR THEIR CLIENTS CONSPIRED AND COLLABORATED TO CONCOCT FICTITIOUS LEGAL COMPLAINTS SOLELY IN RETALIATION AND RETALIATION FOR THEMSELVES MOVING BEEN BROUGHT BEFORE THE COURTS. SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 130-31), (EXHIBITS NO. 134-140 AND 1-9) LEAVE LITTLE DOUBT THAT ZINDS INTENT ON EXPOSING THESE RICO CRIMES AND THATS ^{WAS} WHY ALL THE WAY UP TO THE SUPREME COURT CLERK THE

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY HAS CONSPIRED TO
KEEP ME ("INTENTIONALLY" WRONGFULLY IM-
PRISONED TO PROTECT THE REPUBLICAN
PARTY, WHO THROUGH A NATIONAL CRIMINAL
CONSPIRACY APPOINTED ONLY "REPUBLICAN JUDGES
AND CLERKS TO HANDLE MY CASE BRIEFS
AND COVER-UP THEIR RICO CRIMES.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

Michael G. Peters

JULY 5, 2022

2017190
MICHAEL G. PETERS NO. 12207
STRINGFELLOW UNIT
1200 FM 655
ROSBURGH, TEXAS 77583

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1. TWO (2) FEDERAL JUDGES DISAGREED ON THE SAME POINT OF THE LAW IN RE TO THE IMPOSING OF ~~§~~ THE "THREE-STRIKE PROVISION".
2. I AM AN "ACTUALLY INNOCENT" AMERICAN CITIZEN IMPRISONED FOR EXPOSING GOV. RICK PERRY'S COCCUSION CRIMES COVERING-UP FOR CORPORATE CRIMINALS WHO FABRICATED MY SON'S MEDICAL RECORDS TO DECEIVE A DISTRICT COURT JUDGE INTO REMOVING MY SON FROM MY CUSTODY; AFTER THREE PRIOR FAILED ATTEMPTS.
3. I HAVE BEEN DENIED ALL MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO PRESENT THE "TRUE" FACTS, EVIDENCE AND WITNESSES.
4. I WAS SET-UP WITH A PUBLIC DEFENDER WHO WAS A CONSPIRATOR TO STOP MY PRESENTING THE EVIDENCE EXPOSING THEIR CRIMINAL COVER-UPS.

4. THE RESPONDENT ABUSED THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM AND HER DISCRETION TO BECOME A CRIMINAL HERSELF INVOLVED IN A POLITICAL CORRUPTION PLOT TO COVER-UP GOV. RICK PERRY'S CRIMES WHO SHE THOUGHT WOULD BECOME THE UNITED STATES PRESIDENT INSTEAD OF DONALD TRUMP.
5. THE RESPONDENT TOLD HER COURT REPORTERS TO DELETE OFFICIAL COURT TRANSCRIPTS TO COVER-UP POTENTIALLY HARMFUL TO COURT ROOM OUTBURSTS.
6. THE RESPONDENT TOOK A "CORPORATE BRIBE" TO MAKE SURE THE STATES WITNESSES (ZACHARY DREYER, A CORPORATE CRIMINAL CRIMES DID NOT BECOME KNOWN, WHEREIN SAID CORPORATIONS WOULD NOT BECOME CRIMINALLY LIABLE.
7. THE RESPONDENT WAS COVERING-UP FOR HER CO-WORKER AND FELLOW JUDGE UNETHICALLY AND PROVED HER BIAS, BY STATING: ("AND IT DOESN'T MATTER THAT HE'S A JUDGE") ETC.

8. THE RESPONDENT IS PART OF A NATIONAL
REPUBLICAN PARTY CRIMINAL RACKETEERING
OPERATION OF INTER-CIRCLE REPUBLICANS
SWORN TO SUBVERT THE AMERICAN
JUDICIAL SYSTEM TO IMPOSE THE
REPUBLICAN PARTY'S AGENDAS, LIKE
DONALD TRUMP TRIED TO SUBVERT
THE ELECTION PROCESS.

CONCLUSION

IN CONCLUSION CONSPIRACY TO IMPRISON INNOCENT AMERICAN CITIZENS FOR PROTECTING THEIR CHILDREN FROM MEDICAL RECORDS PROVED TO DECEIVE A UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE INTO CHILD ABDUCTION IS EXTREMELY ILLEGAL...

THE INTENTIONAL WRONGFUL IMPRISONMENT OF AN AMERICAN CITIZEN WHO HAS BECOME THE INVERTED VICTIM OF A "NATIONAL" POLITICAL COVER-UP FOR COLLUSION, RACKETEERING CRIMES BY THE REPUBLICAN PARTY SUBVERSION OF OUR DEMOCRACY.

THE EVIDENCE SPEAKS FOR ITS SELF.

The ~~petition~~^{mem.} petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted

Michael C. L. L. L.

June 30, 2022